

**Facsimile Cover Sheet****To: Examiner Avellino****Fax No. 703-746-9314****From: Jeramie Keys
Withers & Keys, LLC****Fax No. 678-565-4749****Date: August 27, 2004****1 page : cover only****Application No.: 09/712,930****Message Text:****Examiner Avellino,**

As discussed on the phone, I am providing an agenda for our teleconference/interview scheduled for Wednesday the 1st for this case. I have already mailed in a power of attorney listing me as an attorney of record but can provide a copy to you if needed.

Agenda:

Discuss the Fang reference (102 rejections) and the perceived deficiencies of Fang in relation to subject matter of the present invention. Namely, discuss that Fang is concerned with a single sign on system for a client computer to be logged onto multiple system resources with the user only signing on once. Fang is not concerned with a server that has instruction objects that run on the server and that allow the server to communicate with the data systems to thereby provide data system information from the server back to a terminal of a user. To the contrary, Fang does not have a server coupled to the data systems but instead couples the client. The logon coordinator 26 of Fang, which communicates with the various resources needed by the client computer, is NOT executed on the server, as assumed by the Office Action but is instead executed by the client computer to log the client computer onto the resources upon receiving the log on info. (PKM and possibly CIM) from the server that the client has logged onto the single time. At best, Fang only discloses the templates (CIM) used by the client to log on may be stored on the server and accessed by the log on coordinator executing on the client when the client is required to log on to the system resource. Thus, there are significant differences between the present invention and Fang.

Thanks,
Jeramie Keys, 42,724